

Failure of Fermi Liquid Theory in 2-D : A Signal from Perturbation Theory

G. Baskaran[†]

The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Madras 600 113, India

Abstract

We study the perturbative correction to the ground state energy eigenvalue of a 2-dimensional dilute fermi gas with weak short-range two body repulsion. From the structure of the energy shift we infer the presence of an induced two body long range repulsive interaction $\frac{1}{r^2}$ among the constituent electrons indicating a potential instability of the fermi liquid ground state.

The discovery of high T_c superconductivity has led to the revival of interest in the physics of strongly correlated electrons in two dimensions and the possibility of the failure of fermi liquid theory. In this context, Anderson [1,2] claims that in 2-dimensions there is a failure of fermi liquid theory for a dilute gas of fermions even with a weak short-range two body repulsion. Anderson bases his arguments on two important facts: a) the presence of a two particle anti-bound state for arbitrarily small repulsion in a Hubbard model in 2-dimensions [3], and b) presence of a finite two particle phase shift in the forward scattering channel on the fermi surface. Several authors [4–11] have studied this problem, and most of them have concluded [4–8] that at the level of perturbation theory there is no indication of a failure of fermi liquid theory. Anderson [2] has also questioned the appropriateness of certain aspects of conventional perturbation theory to settle this subtle issue.

In this letter we study a dilute fermi gas having a weak short-range two particle repulsion using simple perturbation theory. In particular we look at the energy correction to a pair of fermions with arbitrary momenta $\hbar\mathbf{k}_1$ and $\hbar\mathbf{k}_2$ inside the fermi sea and infer the presence of an induced $\frac{1}{r^2}$ interaction among the constituent fermions.

We identify two terms $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_1}$, as kinetic energy shifts of a fermion at $\mathbf{k}_1$ due to the presence of another at $\mathbf{k}_2$ and vice versa. Their sum $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2} + \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_1}$ is given by the cross channel term, in the language of diagrams [7]. In Landau's fermi liquid theory, this sum is the cross channel contribution to the Landau parameter for the quasi particles. An important point is that $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_1}$ are singular functions of $|\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2|$.

According to us, the natural decomposition of the cross channel diagram into two terms, $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_1}$, and their singular character suggests the following: i) the terms $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_1}$ are physically meaningful separately and ii) we should look at the meaning and consequences of their singularities before we proceed to consider the sum $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2} + \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_1}$ as a Landau parameter for the fermion quasi particles. Our suggestion becomes even more meaningful if the source of the singularity is capable of destroying the fermi liquid ground state.

Having emphasized the importance of the singular character of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_1}$, we

proceed and find that it can be caused by an induced $\frac{1}{r^2}$ two body interaction among the constituent fermions [13]. This induced two particle interaction is interpreted to arise from *the elimination of virtual scattering to high energy states in the presence of the fermi sea, that is included in the perturbation theory* [14].

In the spirit of renormalised perturbation theory, the induced 2-body potential is used in our next step as the effective interaction between the fermions. In 2-d, the long range two body potential $\frac{1}{r^2}$ causes a finite phase shift in the s-channel as the relative momentum tends to zero. This finite phase shift implies a scattering length ‘a’ which diverges as the size of the system. Hence the conventional fermi liquid perturbation expansion in terms of $k_F a$ fails, indicating an instability of the fermi liquid ground state. Here k_F is the fermi wave vector.

At the end of the letter we discuss how our work differs from ealier works [15], in particular that of Stamp [7]. Important differences of our work from that of Anderson are also pointed out at the end.

We now proceed to calculate the correction to the ground state energy following the method of Abrikosov and Khalatnikov [12] which was used recently by some authors for the 2-d case [5,7]. This method is essentially an expansion in powers of the scattering length (a physically measurable quantity) rather than the strength of the bare short range interaction. We consider the following Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m_e} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \frac{1}{L^2} \sum U_q c_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{q}-\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}',-\sigma}$$

where c ’s are the fermion operators and U_q is the Fourier transform of a short range two body interaction $U(r)$. We can also view the above as the low density limit of the Hubbard model in two dimensions, when U_q has no q dependence. Following Stamp and collaborators [7] we define a dimensionless interaction constant α . To second order in α , the ground state energy shift [7,12] is given by

$$\sum \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m_e} n_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \frac{\hbar^2 \alpha}{m_e L^2} \sum n_{\mathbf{k}_1 \uparrow} n_{\mathbf{k}_2 \downarrow} - \left(\frac{\hbar^2 \alpha}{m_e L^2} \right)^2 \times$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \times \sum \frac{n_{\mathbf{k}_1\sigma_1} n_{\mathbf{k}_2\sigma_2} [(1 - n_{\mathbf{k}_3\sigma_3})(1 - n_{\mathbf{k}_4\sigma_4}) - 1]}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_1} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_2} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_3} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_4}} \times \\ & \times \delta_{\sigma_1-\sigma_2} \delta_{\sigma_3-\sigma_4} \delta(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 - \mathbf{k}_3 - \mathbf{k}_4). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The parameter α is defined in terms of U_o as

$$\alpha = \frac{m_e U_o}{\hbar^2} + \frac{U_o^2}{L^2} \sum \frac{\delta(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 - \mathbf{k}_3 - \mathbf{k}_4)}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_1} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_2} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_3} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_4}}. \quad (2)$$

The dependence of α on $\mathbf{k}_1$ and $\mathbf{k}_2$ can be ignored for low densities.

The first term in equation (1) is the unperturbed kinetic energy in the ground state. The second term is the Hartree term. The third term is the most interesting term for us. Let us consider two electrons in states $\mathbf{k}_1\sigma_1$ and $\mathbf{k}_2\sigma_2$. They contribute an energy $\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_e}(k_1^2 + k_2^2)$ to the unperturbed ground state energy eigenvalue. We would like to find out the correction to this two particle contribution from the many body processes considered within our perturbation theory, which is a one step renormalisation. This correction is given by

$$n_{\mathbf{k}_1\sigma_1} n_{\mathbf{k}_2\sigma_2} (\Delta E_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \delta_{\sigma_1, -\sigma_2} + \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} + \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_1}). \quad (3)$$

Here the first term $\Delta E(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2)$ is a symmetric function of $\mathbf{k}_1$ and $\mathbf{k}_2$ and is the Cooper channel contribution. This is not of interest to us, as it does not lead to any momentum shift, whose value is comparable to the k-space lattice spacing $\frac{\pi}{L}$. Hence we will not consider this any more. The second and third terms are the cross channel terms that are unusual [16]. Their existence solely depends on the fact that we have identical particles and a fermi sea. In the absence of the fermi sea they are simply absent in the second order energy correction. Also, $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2}$ is not a symmetric function of $\mathbf{k}_1$ and $\mathbf{k}_2$:

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \equiv \left(\frac{\hbar^2 \alpha}{m_e L^2} \right)^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4} \frac{n_{\mathbf{k}_3\sigma_3} \delta(\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{k}_3 - \mathbf{k}_4)}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_1} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_2} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_3} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_4}}. \quad (4)$$

Since we are interested in finding how occupied states within the fermi sea are affected, we will only consider the case $k_1, k_2 < k_F$. The summation over $\mathbf{k}_3$ and $\mathbf{k}_4$ is easily simplified to give the following two dimensional integral:

$$\frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2|} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{k_F} \frac{k dk d\theta}{\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}}_{12} - k \cos \theta}, \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{k}_{12}$ is the unit vector along the direction of $\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2$. This integral can be performed [7] to give us the result

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} = \frac{\hbar^2 \alpha^2}{2\pi m_e L^2} \frac{\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)}{(\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)^2}. \quad (6)$$

for $|\mathbf{k}_1|, |\mathbf{k}_2| < k_F$.

We give a new interpretation to this singular term. The above expression has the form of an energy increase arising from a Galilean boost - it represents the kinetic energy change arising from a momentum shift. The fermion at $\mathbf{k}_1$ experiences a momentum shift owing to the presence of a fermion at $\mathbf{k}_2$. The momentum shift is

$$\delta \mathbf{p}_{1,2} = \frac{\hbar^2 \alpha^2}{2\pi L^2} \frac{\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)}{(\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)^2}. \quad (7)$$

If we consider two adjacent points in k-space, i.e., $\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2 = \frac{\pi}{L}$, the above momentum shift is

$$\delta p_{1,2} = \frac{\hbar^2 \alpha^2}{2\pi^2 L},$$

which is of the order of the spacing in momentum space and hence indicates a finite phase shift

$$\delta_{ph} \approx \frac{\alpha}{2\pi^2}.$$

This expression agrees with Anderson's phase shift calculation [1] for small U. It is interesting to note that the energy shift (equation 6) has the same form that Anderson [1] proposed as a singular forward scattering term. However, we would like to re-emphasize that ours is not an expression for a scattering amplitude but a correction to the kinetic energy of a particle in scattering state $\mathbf{k}_1$ due to the existence of another particle in scattering state $\mathbf{k}_2$. We will now show that this singular form of kinetic energy shift arises if there is a long range potential of the form $\frac{1}{r^2}$ in 2-dimension.

In what follows we show that a two body problem with a repulsive potential of $\frac{1}{r^2}$ in two dimensions produces the same analytic form of momentum shift as given by equation (5). From this we shall infer the presence of an induced $\frac{1}{r^2}$ potential between two particles at long distances in our many body problem.

In a two body problem *if we know the momentum shift of scattering states for all $\mathbf{k}$, from the form of the kinetic energy correction, we can infer the asymptotic form of the effective two body potential.* This is because the momentum shift directly represents the modification of the wave function in the asymptotic region, which in turn is determined by the phase shift due to the two body scattering. Finally, once we know the two body phase shift for two arbitrary scattering states, we can find the asymptotic behaviour of the potential.

We concentrate on plane wave states and find how their energies get modified due to any phase shifts in the various angular momentum channels. We will consider the repulsive potential $V(r) = \frac{\lambda}{r^2}$ between two particles and consider this in the relative co-ordinate system. Here r is the relative separation between the two particles and λ is a constant. We will assume the following boundary condition on a circle of radius R about the origin: $\psi(r) = 0$ for $r = R$. If we consider a two particle problem in a finite domain like a disc, the boundary condition in terms of the relative co-ordinates is not simple because of the coupling of the center of mass and relative co-ordinates. However, the results are not qualitatively modified by our simplified boundary condition. In the relative co-ordinate system, the Schrodinger equation becomes simple and the scattering states are characterised by radial and angular momentum quantum numbers q and m . The scattering states are Bessel functions, that have the asymptotic form:

$$J_{\sqrt{m^2 + \lambda_o}}(qr) \approx \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi qr}} \cos \left(qr - \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{m^2 + \lambda_o} - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \quad (8)$$

Using this asymptotic form and imposing our boundary condition it is easy to see that the phase shift of the m -th partial wave is

$$\delta_m \sim \frac{\lambda_o \pi}{4m} \quad (9)$$

where $\lambda_o = \frac{2m_e}{\hbar^2} \lambda$. The above states are radial eigen functions. However, we are interested in seeing how plane wave states get modified in the presence of interaction. We can easily obtain the phase shift suffered by the scattering states that are plane waves by the following wave packet analysis [1]. Recall that partial waves are obtained by coherent superposition

of all plane waves having the same magnitude of the wave vector but with various directions in k -space with appropriate phase factors. In the same way we can reconstruct plane waves from the partial waves. In doing so, only the large m partial states contribute dominantly. In fact, if q is the value of the radial momentum, the partial waves that contribute dominantly have the value of m given by $\frac{2\pi m}{R} \approx q$. Substituting this value of m in equation (9) we get the phase shift suffered by the plane wave:

$$\delta_{ph}(q) \approx \frac{\lambda_o \pi^2}{2qR}$$

This phase shift is finite when q takes the least value of $\frac{\pi}{L}$. That is, $\delta_{ph}(q = \frac{\pi}{L}) = \frac{\lambda_o \pi}{2R}$. This finite phase shift in the s -channel as $q \rightarrow 0$ is well known for the $\frac{1}{r^2}$ potential in 2-dimensions. From this we find that the momentum shift suffered by the plane wave with wave vector $\mathbf{q}$ is given by

$$\delta \mathbf{q} \approx \frac{\lambda_o \pi^2}{2qR^2} \hat{q}$$

By symmetry, the direction of momentum shift is in the same direction as $\mathbf{q}$. Notice that the momentum shift has a singular dependence on q . However, the change in kinetic energy in the relative co-ordinate system is

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_e} \frac{\lambda_o \pi^2}{2R^2} \mathbf{q} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{q}}{|\mathbf{q}|^2}$$

which is non-singular and independent of q . Thus the $\frac{1}{r^2}$ potential in 2-dimensions is anomalous in the sense that for two particle plane wave states, the kinetic energy shift of relative motion has no singular dependence on the relative momentum q even though momentum shift is singular. We can substitute $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2$ to go to the laboratory frame and get the shift in the kinetic energy change of particle 1

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\lambda_o \pi^2}{2R^2} \mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)}{(\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)^2}$$

and similarly for particle 2. This energy shift has the same form as the energy shift that we obtained by perturbation theory for any two occupied plane wave states inside the fermi sea (equation 6). Thus the pseudo potential that acts between two electrons in the occupied

states below the fermi surface is of $\frac{1}{r^2}$ type at long distances. By comparing this energy shift with equation (5) we find that the strength of the $\frac{1}{r^2}$ term is given by

$$\lambda = \frac{\hbar^2 \alpha^2}{m_e \pi^3}.$$

Notice that our analysis only brings out the long range part of the effective interaction. The short range divergence is cut off by the actual potential.

Having found a long range renormalised or effective interaction between any two constituent particles in the ground state using perturbation theory, one has to use this as the starting interaction in the spirit of renormalisation procedure to find the properties of the final ground state. We cannot use the conventional perturbation theory with the $\frac{1}{r^2}$ potential. This is because this repulsive potential has a scattering length in 2-d which diverges as L , the size of the system. This is to be contrasted with the scattering length for the short range repulsive potential in 2-d, which diverges as $\log L$. This logarithmic divergence is still manageable in conventional perturbation theory. Once we have a stronger divergence as L there seems to be no way of controlling the conventional perturbation expansion thereby indicating an instability of the fermi liquid ground state.

To get around this difficulty, we have formulated [17] a new approach, which enables us to write down the asymptotic behaviour of low energy many body wave functions that exhibit a non-fermi liquid behaviour. We will discuss this in a forthcoming paper [17].

What does our analysis predict for the known cases of 1 and 3-d interacting fermi gas? In 1-d we get a strong signal from the cross terms apart from other terms, indicating the failure of fermi liquid theory. In 3-d, the cross channel contribution $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2}$ has a singular form

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \sim \frac{1}{L^3 k_F} \frac{\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)}{(\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)^2}. \quad (10)$$

as $\mathbf{k}_1$ and $\mathbf{k}_2$ approaching each other. However, the denominator has an L^3 instead of an L^2 as in two dimensions. We can read off the phase shift and momentum shift when $\mathbf{k}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{k}_2$. The phase shift is $\delta_{ph} \approx \frac{1}{L}$, which vanishes as $L \rightarrow \infty$. The momentum shift vanishes as

$\frac{1}{L^2}$. Therefore, fermi liquid theory survives in 3-d for small repulsive interaction. Thus our results are consistent with known results in one and two dimensions.

In conclusion, we would like to make a comparison of our work with that of Stamp [7]. Stamp followed Landau's theory, like other authors. In addition he was the first to notice the two singular pieces of the cross channel contribution. However, he attributed meaning only to the sum $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} + \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_1}$ (which is non-singular) as a cross channel contribution to the Landau parameter. This led him to conclude that at that level fermi liquid state is stable. On the other hand, we point out that this can be done only as long as there are no parts of the energy correction that is singular, which in principle could indicate the presence of a finite phase shift as the relative momentum tends to zero. For example, in three dimension there is no such correction and fermi liquid theory survives in the sense that there is no finite phase shift. Once a term indicating the presence of a finite phase shift is present, it signals an instability of the fermi liquid state and we have to find the induced interaction that is responsible for the momentum shift and then proceed to get the ground state in the presence of this induced interaction. There are other cases in 2-dimensions, where fermi liquid theory seems to fail [18].

Even though our approach is inspired by Anderson's works, it has the following differences: i) we are not calculating the phase shift in the sense what Anderson does ii) The anomalous energy shift has a singular form very much like the singular forward scattering that Anderson proposed - however, what we are calculating is neither a Landau parameter nor a scattering amplitude, but simply an energy shift. iii) our kinetic energy shift which signals the presence of an induced $\frac{1}{r^2}$ potential occurs for all pairs of electrons inside the fermi sea - it is not confined to states close to the fermi surface. In a sense we give a first microscopic derivation for the induced long range interaction that Anderson has conjectured.

I thank Hide Fukuyama for sending me Stamp's paper [7]. My recent visits sharpened some of my thinking. I thank S. Doniach, R.B. Laughlin (Stanford), P.W. Anderson, D. Sherrington (Oxford), P. Guinea and D. Campbell (San Sebastian) for hospitality. I thank Muthukumar for several proof readings.

REFERENCES

‡ baskaran@imsc.ernet.in

- [1] P. W. Anderson, Chapter 6 of Princeton RVB book(to be published); P. W. Anderson and Y. Ren, High Temperature Superconductors, Editors K. S. Bedell et al, Proc. of the International Conference on “ Physics of the Highly Correlated Electron Systems ” , Los Alamos 1989 (Addison-Wesley, NY 1989)pp 1-33. Physica Scripta, **T42**,11 (1992); Progress of Theoretical Physics, Supplement **107**,41,(1992); Phys. Rev. Letters **67**,2092(1991); Phys. Rev. Letters **67**,384(1991); Phys. Rev. Letters,**64**,2306 (1990); and Phys. Rev. Letters,**66**,3226 (1991).
- [2] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Letters,**71**,1220 (1993).
- [3] G. Baskaran and T. Hsu, Unpublished, 1987
- [4] J. Engelbrecht and M. Randeria, Phys. Rev. Letters, **65**,1032 (1990) and **66**,325 (1991).
- [5] J.R. Engelbrecht et.al., Phys. Rev. **45**,10135 (92).
- [6] H. Fukuyama et.al, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn, **60**, 372(1991); S. Yarlagadda and S. Kurihara, Phys. Rev. **48**, 10567 (1993).
- [7] P. C. E. Stamp, J. de Physique I,**3**,625 (1993); and references therein .
- [8] G. Benfatto and G. Gallavotti, J. Stat. Phys. **59**, 541 (1990); Phys. Rev. **42**, 9967 (1990); R. Shankar, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **B6**,749 (1992); Yale preprint (1993); C. Castellani et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett., **72**,316 (1994);M. Fabrizio et.al, Phys. Rev. **B44**,1033 (1991).
- [9] C. Hodges et.al., Phys. Rev. **B4**, 302(1971); P. Bloom, Phys. Rev. **B12**, 125 (1975) ; M. B. Vetrovec, G. M. Caneiro, Phys. Rev. **B22**, 1250 (1980).
- [10] Hua Chen and Daniel Mattis, Utah preprint (1993)
- [11] S.Yu. Khlebnikov, UCLA preprint 91/TEP/50 and 92/TEP/10; R. Valenti and C. Gros, Phys. Rev. Lett., **68**, 2412 (1992).

- [12] A. A. Abrikosov, I. Khalatnikov, JETP **6**, 888(1958) ; Landau and Lifshitz series, Statistical Physics Part 2, Vol .9, (Pergamon Press, NY 1980) sec. 6.
- [13] In the process we also show that the energy shifts of two particle scattering states for $\frac{1}{r^2}$ potential in 2-dimension is strange in the sense that the relative momentum shift is a singular function of $(\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)$, whereas the kinetic energy shift of relative motion is not.
- [14] That is, this perturbation theory is viewed as a one step renormalisation procedure, in the same sense as that of a degenerate perturbation theory that one does for large U Hubbard model, which at half filling induces a pairwise Heisenberg spin coupling.
- [15] Our approach should be contrasted with the other approaches, where one attempts to get the two particle scattering amplitude using a perturbation theory for electron or hole self energy or the two particle T matrix. We wish to clarify that we do not go off-shell and look at quasi particles or quasi holes.
- [16] These cross channel terms are anomalous - they represent certain anomalous processes. The term $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2}$ is the second order energy correction of an interacting ‘particle’ and a ‘hole’: particle in state $\mathbf{k}_1\sigma_1$ and a hole in state $-\mathbf{k}_2\sigma_2$ with kinetic energy $-\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_2}$. Notice that both the particle and hole have momenta lying inside the fermi sea ! In this sense they are anomalous and represent processes that seem to violate the Pauli principle and the fundamental definition of particle and hole. It is easily seen that as the fermi momentum vanishes this term also vanishes.
- [17] G. Baskaran, unpublished manuscript
- [18] P.A. Bares and X.G. Wen, Phys. Rev. **B48**, 8636 (1993); J. Polchinski, NSF-ITP-93-33; C. Nayak and F. Wilczek, PUPT 1438, IASSNS 93/89.